



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/605,058 09/05/2003		Jonathan DeLine	U02-0161.36	2057	
24239	7590	06/03/2005	EXA		MINER
MOORE & P.O. BOX 13		LEN PLLC	NGUYEN, KHAI MINH		
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2687	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)					
		10/605,058	,	DELINE, JONATHAN					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	,	Art Unit	_				
	-	Khai M Ngu	IVAN	2687					
_	The MAILING DATE of this communica				_				
Period fo		• •		·					
THE - External after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA SISING SOME AND A COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever cation. ays, a reply within the statut ory period will apply and will by statute, cause the applic	nt, however, may a reply be time cory minimum of thirty (30) days expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONEI	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 05 September 20	003.						
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims								
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the app	lication.							
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
•	Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.								
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicat	on Papers								
91	The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.							
•	10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>05 September 0203</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.								
,	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the								
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by								
Priority ı	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	foreian priority und	er 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).					
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of: 1.☐ Certified copies of the priority do			-(a) or (i).					
	2. Certified copies of the priority do	cuments have beer	ı received in Applicati	on No					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of	the priority docume	nts have been receive	ed in this National Stage					
	application from the Internationa	l Bureau (PCT Rule	: 17.2(a)).						
* (See the attached detailed Office action f	or a list of the certif	ed copies not receive	∤d.					
Attach-s-	.*/c\								
Attachmer	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)					
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO		Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate					
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/5/03, 8/4/04</u> .	O/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)					

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 5, 2003 and August 4, 2004 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449 form or PTO/SB/08A and 08B forms).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes (U.S.Pub-2050009567) in view of White et al. (U.S.Pat-6353413).

Regarding claim 1, Holmes teaches a remote control device (RCD) (fig.1-2, element 14') comprising:

a second wireless interface for communicating with a mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0022, the remote communication module 30 transmits a dialing signal toward the mobile communication device 16' based on a dialing request from the user interface 28');

Art Unit: 2687

a speaker for outputting audio signals received from the mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0024-0025);

a microphone for receiving audio signals to be transmitted to the mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0024-0025); and

a processor for processing wireless signals communicated between the RCD and the mobile phone (fig.2-3, paragraph 0028-0030), wherein the RCD:

receives a signal from the mobile phone in response to the mobile phone receiving a wireless signal from a digital cellular network (DCN) (fig.1-2, abstract, paragraph 0017, 0021); and

processes the received signal from the mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0018-0019).

Holmes fails to specifically discloses a first wireless interface for controlling one or more peripheral devices. However, White teaches a first wireless interface for controlling one or more peripheral devices (col.1, lines 26-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a first wireless interface for controlling one or more peripheral devices as taught by White with Holmes teaching in order to provide a universal remote control unit adapted to control virtually all household appliances.

Art Unit: 2687

Regarding claim 2, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 1 wherein the signal received by the RCD from the mobile phone is an audio signal used for establishing a telephone call (paragraph 0024, 0025).

Regarding claim 3, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 2 wherein processing the received signal from the mobile phone comprises using the RCD to connect to a telephone call received by the mobile phone (paragraph 0024, 0025).

Regarding claim 4, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 3 wherein the RCD transmits the audio signal received from the mobile phone to one of the one or more peripheral devices to be audibly output (paragraph 0024, 0025, see White, col.1, lines 26-39).

Regarding claim 5, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 1 wherein the signal received by the RCD from the mobile phone is a data signal selected from the group consisting of a text data signal, an audio data signal, a video data signal, and any combination thereof (paragraph 0017, 0024-0025).

Regarding claim 6, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 5 wherein the act of processing the received signal from the mobile phone comprises transmitting the data signal received from the mobile phone to one of the one or more peripheral devices to be output (paragraph 0017, 0024-0025, see White, col.3, lines 22-34).

Regarding claim 7, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 1 wherein the signal received by the RCD from the mobile phone is a data signal selected from the group consisting of an SMS message, an MMS message, and an e-mail message (paragraph 0017, 0024-0025, see White, col.3, lines 22-34).

Regarding claim 8, Holmes and white further teaches the RCD of claim 7 wherein processing the received signal from the mobile phone comprises transmitting the data signal received from the mobile phone to one of the one or more peripheral devices to be output (paragraph 0017, 0024-0025, see White, col.3, lines 22-34).

Regarding claim 9, Holmes teaches a remote control device (RCD) communicable with a mobile phone and one or more peripheral devices (fig.1-2, paragraph 0017), the RCD comprising:

means for controlling the mobile phone to (fig.1, paragraph 0017):

Art Unit: 2687

process signals received from the mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0024-0025); output signals received from the mobile phone (fig.2, paragraph 0024-0025);

handle an incoming telephone call received by the mobile phone from a digital cellular network (DCN) (fig.1-2, abstract, paragraph 0017, 0021); and

Holmes fails to specifically discloses controlling the one or more peripheral devices such that signals received from the mobile phone can be transmitted to the one or more peripheral devices. However, White teaches controlling the one or more peripheral devices such that signals received from the mobile phone can be transmitted to the one or more peripheral devices (col.1, lines 26-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use as taught by White with Holmes teaching in order to provide a universal remote control unit adapted to control virtually all household appliances.

Regarding claim 10, Holmes and White further teaches the RCD of claim 9 further comprising:

processing means for processing signals received from the mobile phone (paragraph 0017, 0024-0025); a speaker for outputting audio signals received from the mobile phone (paragraph 0023-0024); and

a microphone for inputting audio signals to be sent to the mobile phone (paragraph 0023-0024).

Regarding claim 11, Holmes and White further teaches the RCD of claim 10 wherein the remote control device further comprises a user interface to control the output of data received from the mobile phone (paragraph 0023-0024).

Regarding claim 12, Holmes and White further teaches the RCD of claim 11 wherein the remote control device further comprises a video display to display video or text data received from the mobile (paragraph 0017, see white, fig.2, col.3, line 50 to col.4, line 4).

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Lee (U.S.Pub-20030040334) discloses Apparatus and method of interacting with a mobile phone using a TV system.

Arling et al. (U.S.Pub-20040266419) discloses System and method for monitoring remote control transmissions.

Kaars (U.S.Pat-6741684) discloses Interactive TV using remote control with built-in phone.

Parvulescu et al. (U.S.Pat-5802460) discloses Telephone handset with remote controller for transferring information to a wireless messaging device.

Application/Control Number: 10/605,058

Art Unit: 2687

Beecroft (U.S.Pat-6760415) discloses Voice telephone system.

Gertner et al. (U.S.Pub-20040004603) discloses Portable computer-based device and computer operating method.

Combaluzier (U.S.Pat-5973475) discloses Remote smart battery.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khai M Nguyen whose telephone number is 571.272.7923. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on 571.272.7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Khai Nguyen

Au: 2687

5/24/2005

ELISEO RAMOS-FELICIANO PATENT EXAMINER

Page 8